DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 162 584 HE 010 684

AUTHOR Thornberry, Mary
TITLE Unexpected Benefits, Expected Defeats: Affirmative Action for Women.
PUB DATE [Nov 78]
NOTE 48p.

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.83 HC-$2.06 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Affirmative Action; *College Faculty; Community Colleges; Comparative Analysis; Department Directors (School); *Employment Practices; Equal Opportunities (Jobs); *Females; Higher Education; Interviews; Minority Groups; Personnel Selection; Questionnaires; Racial Discrimination; Sex Discrimination; State Universities; *Teacher Selection; *Women Professors
IDENTIFIERS Department Chairpersons

ABSTRACT

A study was conducted to determine the effect of affirmative action on faculty hiring practices. Difficulties in looking for relevant data are outlined, and stories of some hiring decisions are explored in depth to provide concrete illustrations of the pitfalls. Data gathered from department heads on their perceptions of affirmative action in their departments are summarized, and the unexpected benefits of pressures for affirmative action are explored. Questionnaires were sent to department heads at two large state universities to determine what was happening at the department level. Ninety questionnaires were returned for a response rate of 62 percent. The data focus on hiring decisions: specifically the numbers of women and minorities chosen, reasons for the selections, the degree of understanding of the concept of affirmative action, and possibilities for reverse discrimination. Interviews were also conducted with faculty, staff, and administrators at these state universities, and comparison interviews with similar personnel were held at several community colleges. A sample questionnaire is appended. (SW)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED162584

JAN 03

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Mary Thornberry

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC) AND USERS OF THE ERIC SYSTEM."

Unexpected Benefits, Expected Defeats: Affirmative Action For Women

By

Mary Thornberry
University of Arizona

HE 010 684

Unexpected Benefits, Expected Defeats: Affirmative Action For Women

Despite the abundance of rhetoric as to the pros and cons of affirmative action, there is remarkably little evidence as to how the plans are working out in practice.[1] Numerous reasons exist for the scarcity. Some are conceptual, some methodological, some political. While delineating what some of the difficulties are, this paper will offer some fragmentary evidence as to how things are working out on college and university campuses.

By now the legal background of the concept of affirmative action should be clear. Executive orders beginning as early as World War II placed requirements about hiring standards on government contractors.[2] As the rationale for these requirements shifted from efficiency to justice, the scope of the coverage broadened. Now all institutions having contracts in excess of $50,000 with the federal government are required:

> ...not [to] discriminate against any employee or applicant for employment because of race, color, religion, sex or national origin. The contractor will take affirmative action to ensure that applicants are employed, and that employees are treated during employment, without regard to their race, color, religion, sex or national origin. Such action shall include, but not be limited to the following: employment, upgrading, demotion, or transfer; recruitment or recruitment advertising; layoff or termination; rates of pay or other forms of compensation; and selection for training, including apprenticeship.[3]

The meaning of this order has been further expanded by the Office of Federal Contract Compliance in what is sometimes known as Revised Order No. 4:

> Sec. 60-2.10 An affirmative action program is a set of specific and result-oriented procedures to which a contractor commits himself to apply every good faith effort. The objective of those procedures plus such efforts is equal employment opportunity. Procedures without effort to make them work are meaningless; and effort, undirected by specific and meaningful procedures is inadequate. An acceptable affirmative action program must include an analysis of areas within which the contractor is deficient in the utilization of minority groups and women, and further, goals and timetables to which the contractor's good faith efforts must be directed to correct the deficiencies and, thus to achieve prompt and full utilization of minorities and women, at all levels and in all segments of his work force where deficiencies exist.[4]

The whole concept of affirmative action has gained national attention through the Bakke case.[5] There the issue is not hiring but admission to medical school. Seldom has a case been debated in public so thoroughly before the Supreme Court has ruled. Yet in spite of the debate, confusion exists as to what the actual effects of affirmative action are in practice. Whatever the Court says on the matter of quotas, the problem of making some sort of affirmative action program workable will remain.[6]

What will surely be needed is a reassessment of how things are working out in practice under current affirmative action programs. The lack of real data in this area is amazing.[7] Certainly we can expect variation from industry to industry and from one geographic region to another. This study represents a step toward discovery by observing what front line administrators are doing in one participating industry; higher education.

There are many reasons for thinking that higher education may be unique in many repects. Some writers have urged that universities be exempted almost entirely from the standards of affirmative action, at least in matters of faculty hiring.[8] At the same time much of the debate on the propriety of the policy behind the executive orders has focused on the campus.[9] Here is an attempt to give factual underpinings to that debate.

The data in this study are of two sorts. One involves a questionnaire sent to department heads at two large state universities. Both operate under a headship system designed to maximize administrative control over departments; heads are thus in many ways the front line administrators most involved in policy implementation. The other source comes from interviews conducted with faculty, staff, and administrators at these state universities. As a comparison interviews with similar personnel were held at several community colleges.

The purpose of the study was to find out what effect affirmative action was having on faculty hiring practices. From the beginning it was clear that totals of women and minorities in faculty ranks would not tell the whole story, although such figures cannot be ignored. The first section of the paper will outline just what the difficulties are in looking for relevant data. The second will explore the stories of some hiring decisions in depth to give concrete illustration of the pitfalls. The third section will summarize the data gathered from department heads as to their perceptions of affirmative action in

their own departments. Finally the unexpected benefits of pressures for affirmative action will be explored.

I. Good Data Are Hard to Find

The very real fact of conscious discrimination against women and minorities is easily forgotten in this new age. Since under executive order all government contractors are now pledged not only to cease such discrimination but also to take affirmative action to seek out women and minorities, the tables have presumably turned.[10] Disputes about availability and underutilization can barely hide real fears of rigid quota systems and reverse discrimination. What is going on?

The question is a very complex one in most colleges and universities since faculty hiring often displays power fragmentation in the extreme. Variations within an institution are profound as an elected committee operates in one department while a department head makes unilateral choices in another. Veto power (and sometimes real power) rests with deans or vice-presidents. Just knowing where to look or whom to praise or blame is thus no simple matter.

The concept of affirmative action involves those in administration setting a clear policy for all decision makers. Monitoring of progress and some centralized review procedures are obviously necessary and bothersome. In theory directives about proper procedures flow to whoever is in charge of hiring and that person or persons act in full knowledge that decisions are open to scrutiny and can or will be reviewed.

If one wanted to look at whether or not an institution was conforming to stated policy, two routes would suggest themselves. The first would be to ask about the existence of an affirmative action plan. The response would most likely be that such a plan was in the process of being drafted or revised. While nothing in this world is ever final, affirmative action plans behave remarkably like chameleons. Drawing up such a plan is admittedly a complicated procedure which can take time. However, the role of a plan as an accepted standard or goal can suffer if it becomes a transitory phenomenon.[11]

The second logical step would be to inquire about the numbers of women and minorities who have been hired in recent years. Are totals increasing? In most institutions the answer is that no dramatic progress has been made toward bringing significant numbers of formerly excluded groups into the system.[12] Some of the difficulties in tracking down the minute changes which have occurred need to be explored. First is the necessity for establishing some baseline which can be used as a point for comparison. Comparison across institutions can be very difficult because of the shifting nature of such baselines. Are librarians (a traditionally female occupation) included? Are counselors? How are administrators counted? When during the year are data gathered? Even within an institution the baseline may be changed from year to year as new systems of record keeping are instituted. This study involves two major state institutions which we shall refer to as A and B.

At University A, for example, a committee on university women began gathering information on numbers of women and minorities in faculty and staff positions in 1973. In 1974 a set of figures were provided by the administration which showed that the number of women in the higher ranks had not increased at all; however, the caution was added that such figures were not comparable to earlier ones because they were based on a different semester. Later figures have been presented in a slightly different format making the comparison even more complex (see Table 1). Dealing with staff hiring is even more confusing because of the large numbers of ways the data could be grouped. Since most institutions do employ large numbers of women and minorities but in lower paying jobs, some categorization is needed. At the very least some breakdown by pay grade is desirable although even that may mask sex and race segregation (Table 2).

****

TABLES 1,2 ABOUT HERE

****

In a time when large numbers of new faculty are not being hired, it is especially crucial that women and minorities be included in recruitment procedures. Certainly such is the aim of affirmative action. Any adequate monitoring of affirmative action plans should include some data on what percentage of applicants were women and what percentage of women applicants reached the final review stage. The latter information is harder

Table 1

University A

Men and Women in Academic Positions

	Professor			Associate Professor			Assistant Professor		
	Number		%	Number		%	Number		%
	Men	Wom.	Wom.	Men	Wom.	Wom.	Men	Wom.	Wom.
1972-73	531	36	6.4	308	34	9.9	277	70	20.2
1973-74	554	33	5.6	314	35	10.0	290	76	20.8
1975-76	518	25	4.6	312	46	12.8	268	78	22.6
1976-77	536	28	5.0	311	48	13.4	256	72	22.0

Full time: 10 and 12 month contracts.

Table 2

University A

Average Compensation of Fulltime
Classified Staff Personnel

	Men		Women	
Grade	No.	Average Salary $	No.	Average Salary $
01	1	7,176	1	4,576
02	6	5,005	62	4,710
03	14	4,731	70	4,890
04	185	5,159	258	5,286
05	41	5,562	394	5,582
06	90	6,167	120	6,174
07	249	6,594	521	6,461
08	77	7,265	348	7,053
09	170	8,164	140	7,918
10	191	8,752	199	8,467
11	222	9,966	248	9,644
12	158	10,944	113	10,769
13	78	12,188	76	11,787
14	96	13,403	35	12,552
15	99	15,342	12	14,401
16	50	18,040	2	18,349
17	6	19,193	1	20,494

Data as of November 1, 1975

to obtain since it depends on adequate record keeping by departments and some centralized review procedure.

The problem is compounded in the case of minorities since there are no obvious clues on application forms as to who fits where. One solution is to send out separate cards to everyone who applies, but there can be confusion in differential return rates. I personally am suspicious of such methods, having received such forms in the last few years from institutions to which I never applied. There seems to be further difficulties caused by administrators who count non-citizen applicants as minorities. While discrimination here is not to be encouraged, it would not seem in line with the intent of the executive order to define labor pools in world wide terms.

Asking questions about the final review stage also presents some difficulties. In the days when three or four finalists for every position were invited to campus for personal interviews, matters were easier to monitor. Now budget crunches have made it likely that candidates will be ranked and invited one at a time until a satisfactory candidate arrives. In at least one instance I discovered that other candidates were told they could travel at their own expense if they wished to compete, and several accepted the offer. The real difficulty is that the "final group" concept often no longer applies. The group may be highly fluid. Decision makers may present only one candidate as a serious possibility.

Thus an investigator asking about the improved chances of women and minorities to compete for position will most likely

find the data muddled. The presence or absence of national advertising is one good clue that genuine efforts may be underway. Yet anyone familiar with the process must realize the possibilities for abuse inherent in specifying qualifications for such positions. In one instance where a department had decided that they wanted one particular scholar, they wrote an advertisement which one observor described as "specifying everything but height and hair color." When the applicant decided not to accept, the position was redefined.

National advertising if done for a sufficient length of time is almost certain to bring in large numbers of applications. One critical step for the success of affirmative action is to be sure that qualified women and minorities survive early rounds of screening. Often this stage is the least structured and most difficult either to monitor or evaluate. With enough women and minorities available to sit on such committees, the problems can be somewhat lessened.

Black males are both helped (to avoid prejudicial screening) and handicapped (by not appearing different) because they are usually invisible at this stage. Unlike women, Chicanos, or most other minorities, their names give no clue as to their identity. Participation in black studies programs, work experiences with black civic groups, attendance at racially identifiable institutions, or subtle hints in letters of recommendations may help here. When standing out from the crowd is crucial, being black might be a help. Even those anxious to recruit such

candidates may miss clues. Likewise the investigator out to monitor the success of affirmative action or to measure the potential job pool may run into problems here. Because of sheer numbers of applicants, decisions are likely to be made quickly and intuitively. Justifying each rejection would be inordinately time consuming. Yet if all women and minorities get screened out at this stage, discrimination may still be at work.

Following up on such decisions at the institutional level is particularly deceiving because averages within colleges can mask individual cases of discrimination. Imagine a situation where there are three openings: one each in departments of history, math, and English. History gets 20 per cent female applicants; math, one per cent; English, 40 per cent. Among those seriously considered (let us assume a finalists pool of ten applicants for each department), history has three, math none and English one. History eventually hires a woman while the others do not. Averaging these figures by college obscures the fact that math attracted almost no applicants, English has screened out women early on a highly differential basis, and history seems to have "favored" women. All these decisions may have been made on very legitimate academic grounds. There is nothing per se to indicate that the English department has violated the law just as the history department should not be immediately hailed to court for reverse discrimination. All should be prepared to explain their decision. However, it is the requirement for such rationales that have generated much of the resentment against the whole concept

of affirmative action. Particularly if such patterns persist over time (as they have in academia), inquiries from an affirmative action officer are in order.

One of the major problems has been that such internal data as these are seldom readily available to any campus group wishing to monitor progress toward affirmative action plans. While such data are usually reported to an institution's affirmative action officer (or comparable administrative official), it is likely to get buried in files and never see the light of day. Systematic and critical review of departmentally based decisions would appear to be rare. Quite frequently persons given the title of affirmative action officer spend most of their hours working to settle grievances (usually from staff) of those already hired. If a separate office for faculty exists, it is likely to be part of a larger job responsibility often described as assistant vice-president. As part of the top administration, such officers face potentially conflicting role demands: few are able to satisfy campus activist groups without creating problems for department heads or deans.

Thus several roadblocks exist in trying to find out what progress is being made in affirmative action. One is the establishment of a baseline and an accepted method of gathering and classifying data which can be used for cross time (and preferably cross institutional) comparisons. Second is inclusion of data about pre-hiring decisions, especially statistics involving early stages of the screening process. Such data must

be kept for every job opening and at the very least separated by department. Finally is the availability of such data to local campus groups who wish to screen it and raise questions. While ideally such work is the role of someone connected with the affirmative action program, in practice such individuals are usually tied down with individual complaints or engaged in numerous other activites. Such information should already be available in required reports and would require little additional effort to assemble.

II. Bad Decisions Are Easy to Justify

Reluctance to open affirmative action data to local groups is quite legitimately grounded in fears of lawsuits. Litigation arising from such complaints is growing at a rapid pace on almost every campus. Administrators are naturally reluctant to add fuel to an already roaring fire which might easily burn them. The answer to this objection must be that the law has given new rights which must be enforced. Quite practically, anyone wishing to file such a complaint will be able to extract such information sooner or later in any case. Moreover, lawsuits are not cheap and not every rejected applicant will file suit. Perhaps the best response is that well documented procedures will result in no suits being filed. Exposure of information may reduce rather than increase litigation.

The burden of proof in discrimination cases ultimately rests on those who claim to have been injured. Statistical patterns may

be used, however, to shift some of the burden to defending institutions.[13] The legal technicalities in such cases may hinder rather than help clarify the complexities involved in any personnel decision for university faculty. A sketch of some possible scenarios may illustrate why good decisons are hard to make but bad ones are often easily justified.

Once a vacancy occurs in a department, the two most crucial questions to be asked in filling it are field of specilization and rank. Let us address the latter first. Assume that a university is out to upgrade its national image. One of the quickest (though not the cheapest) ways to do so is to hire a "star," an established senior scholar with a national reputation. Given past histories of scholastic politics, almost no fields are highly populated at the top levels by women and minorities. Even finding such individuals at tenured ranks is rare. Most institutions recognize that the hiring of stars is of a different nature than the regular recruitment process. At least one professional association specifically asserts that hiring a full professor need not be preceeded by an ad in the national newsletter. Competition for nationally known experts is to be expected. It should be recognized, however, that such procedures can have adverse effects on affirmative action in two ways. One is that slots which go to stars are almost by definition slots from which women and minorities are excluded. The second is that money spent for one star might hire two assistant professors.[14]

A third difficulty which occasionally arises is that of the

star's spouse. Is it legitimate to hire the spouse as well as the star as part of a package deal? When the qualifications of both are outstanding and meet university needs, the issue is not critical. More than once, however, I have heard of instances when the spouse alone would not have been considered. Elaborate charades were enacted to select the spouse as finalist in a supposedly open-ended search. Such practices must be avoided and choices made on the merits of each or on the pair as a team. While the possibilities of a package deal remains, the package should be carefully examined.

For all these problems, some exceptions for stars seem inevitable. What should not be allowed is a subterfuge which employs the "rank open" wording to disguise an attempt to reach only one particular candidate. Once a star candidate becomes unavailable, a return to the regular search procedure should be swift. Under no circumstances should the protege of the star be accepted as the best possible replacement without some type of other recruitment effort.

The description of the desired field or subfield of specialization presents even more grounds for confusion. Often job descriptions represent hard fought battles and uneasy compromises within departments as to what is really needed. A candidate who meets all facets of some descriptions would be a bionic marvel. On the other hand, at times one advertisement may be designed to give a wide choice of qualified applicants just in case that second slot opens up after all.

The job of screening the initial files can only bring anguish and despair to conscientious decision makers. Any one who has sat in such a position can testify to the qualms of deciding peoples' futures on the basis of fragmented information. While many applicants fill virtually none of the qualifications, others send in such barren vita that it is impossible to tell more than name and alma mater.

On the second round of screening the obvious problem is that no candidates are alike and that departmental needs are multiple. Assume a vacancy in comparative politics, for example. Some good candidates can be eliminated because their specialties overlap too heavily with those already on the faculty. Others seem too narrowly defined: Do we really need an expert on Nepal? In other cases the choice is more difficult: A Chinese specialist in no way overlaps with an Africanist and there is no immediate clue as to which would attract more students or publish more interesting work. While not equal in the sense of being entirely interchangeable, the candidates may look equally promising.

It is at these last stages where truly hard choices must be made. If one consciously or unconsciously wishes to eliminate women or minorities, it is all too easy to do so. Because the final choice will depend in part on the qualifications of the finalists, firm guidelines are almost impossible to establish beforehand. After the decision is made, anyone could offer a multitude of reasons for the choice. The real problem comes in making sure that unseen and unmentioned factors like racism and

sexism are not at work. Ultimately no solutions may exist except to put open minded people on selection committees. Yet if such people composed all such committees, no problems would ever have existed in the first place.

Establishing guidelines ahead of time can solve some of the problem. As mentioned above, job descriptions themselves do not always contain information as to what is truly relevant. Discussing criteria for selection is a technique repugnant to many academics, but we must be aware of the importance of the practice and insist on its acceptance.

All the discussion thus far presumes some sort of a committee system in faculty selection. In some departments such committees are almost never formed and decisions rest in the hands of department heads or deans. More difficult to spot are cases where committees are stacked with compliant followers of decision makers. Extensive probing may be necessary to discover the real politics of the situation.

Indeed the difficulty inherent in the hiring procedure is that personnel decisions must be made behind doors that are at least partly closed. Confidential letters of recommendation are, of course, part of the reason. Frank and open exchange among committee members is another. Once the meetings are over, records can be produced to show why almost any decision was the right one. This situation will inevitably be true in academia where training is quite specialized and skills are not entirely interchangeable. No standardized tests exist which can be given to predict success in entering candidates.

Even deans and university presidents must rely most of the time on judgements made in secret. While various institutions give veto power to someone beyond the department level, the information on which such decisions are made may be sketchy. The usual procedure is a twenty minute interview to decide social grace and perhaps the ability to perform under pressure. Rarely does a candidate get vetoed at this stage unless the department is out of line with university policy on some (perhaps unrelated) issue or some major fa x pas is committed.

Rejections do occur for various reasons, however, and these instances are often instructive in revealing how the hiring process actually works. At larger institutions votes of the faculty are often used as bench marks--although it is not unknown for offers to be made in the face of explicit faculty rejection. Discerning reasons for negative votes takes sophistication. "He didn't strike me as a promising scholar," may really mean, "I thought the guy had lousy table manners and his major professor once tore me apart at a national meeting." In most cases no reasons at all are recorded for individual votes.

In some cases a national recruitment effort may hide a predeliction for the old-boy network. One informant worded the justification something like this; "Our field isn't such a big one. There are really only ten top departments in the country--at most. I'm in touch with them all the time and it's extremely unlikely that anybody who is really good could get a Ph.D. in this field without being brought to my attention. Sure we

advertise, but I have yet to see anyone I thought worthy of serious consideration who I didn't know about beforehand." The speaker was a social scientist who could doubtless have quoted articles on selective perception, but didn't.

One final aspect to this problem is that genuinely bad decisions (as opposed to unfair ones) are in fact rare. Most of those hired even under the worst of the old-boy network are promising scholars and teachers. The issue is one of the equally promising candidates who are never seriously considered. Given the nature of the selection process, only an insider could tell--but probably won't. Less than the best is very easy to justify.

III. What is Going On?

In order to find out what was happening at the department level in an obscure corner of the universe, questionnaires were sent to department heads at two large universities. Ninety were returned for a response rate of sixty-two percent. Department heads were chosen as respondents because of their knowledge about hiring decisions and their perceptions of its impact on departmental affairs.

A preliminary word should be addressed to the question of other sources of information. At both universities there has been controversy over salary equalization procedures, and that debate has brought a modicum of other information to light. At University B the result has been publication of individual

salaries on a departmental level. This information is released yearly and placed in the university library. At University A comparable data are available by signing out reports from the administration building. Summary figures have been furnished by affirmative action offices at both universities. While such figures give only totals and tell nothing about hiring decisions as such, they obviously offer a starting point for the even more problematic area of salary equity.

The data for this study focus on hiring decisions: specifically the numbers of women and minorities chosen, reasons for the selections, the degree of understanding of the concept of affirmative action, and possibilities for reverse discrimination. The actual questionnaire is reprinted in Appendix I.

One of the first surprises is that in a time of alleged retrenchment, these universities are continuing to hire faculty. Most of this activity seems to represent turnover rather than expansion, but hiring is being done. When asked whether or not they had hired anyone to a fulltime position in the faculty in the past two years, 82 of the 90 departments reported they had. Another was still looking for candidates. Both the median and modal figure was three new hires per department with a total of 292 slots filled.[15] Undoubtedly the actual number of new hires was even greater considering the departments that did not respond or were not included in the survey.

In terms of applicants for those positions, neither women nor minorities were appearing in large numbers. As far as

perceptions of the heads are concerned, the modal figure was five per cent women. However, 24 departments reported figures of greater than ten percent. For minorities the picture was similar except that the percent of "don't know" responses was greater. The difficulty in discerning minority candidates is a real one and not easily solved without some additional information.

In terms of hiring patterns, women fared better than one might have expected from such low numbers of reported applicants. 48 departments hired no women, including those which had no openings. In departments with vacancies about half hired at least one woman. To put it another way, of the 292 vacancies, 69 were filled by women. Thus slightly over one out of every five vacancies went to women, a ratio of 23 per cent.

For minorities the figures were smaller. 67 departments hired none. Of the 23 departments which did hire, the modal figure was one hire per department with a total of 36 vacancies filled by minority candidates.

No attempt was made to check on the accuracy of these figures. Since questionnaires were returned anonymously, it was impossible to identify which departments had responded. Unless heads deliberately lied, however, the totals for those hired should be reasonably accurate. The percentages of applicants may be harder to judge. Much depends on how accurate the records are on a departmental level, and university officials have not been consistent in developing forms or in requesting such information. Random checks revealed that often no systematic efforts were made to spot black candidates, for example.

At neither university are totals of women and minorities rising dramatically. At University A, for instance, the numbers of women are actually dropping in some ranks. While figures for 1977 are not available yet, the past history (Table 1) suggests that such effort needs to be made not to fall behind.

Just what does contribute to a decision to hire women? Obviously information based on statistical totals can be misleading, especially when the original questionnaire covered relatively few options. It does seem clear that the larger the percentage of women who apply, the more likely it is that women will be hired. Lest that conclusion sound self evident, note that the same progression does not follow for minorities (Table 3). Certainly it is obvious that in either case if none applies, none will be chosen. It may be true also that underestimates of both groups is common; one wonders how likely it is with only one per cent female applicants that women do get chosen. In both cases it would seem that a visibility line of around ten per cent greatly enhances the possibility of final selection.

****

TABLE 3 ABOUT HERE

****

Some of the negative findings are illuminating in light of charges which have been leveled against government agencies. Table 4 examines the relationship between hiring rates and perceived pressure for affirmative action. First one wonders

Table 3

Hiring Rates and Applications

	Percentage Applicants			
	None	Low (1-5)	Medium (6-10)	High (11
a. Women Hired				
None	100.0	66.7	25.0	16.7
1 or More	0.0	33.3	75.0	83.3
	N = 13	N = 27	N = 12	N = 24
b. Minorities Hired				
None	100.0	64.9	25.0	70.0
1 or More	0.0	35.1	75.0	30.0
	N = 20	N = 37	N = 4	N = 10

Table 4

Hiring Rates and Pressure for Affirmative Action

Pressure:	None	Slight	Great
a. Women Hired			
None	46.2	56.0	40.0
1 or More	66.7	44.0	60.0
	N = 52	N = 25	N = 5
b. Minorities Hired			
None	71.2	72.0	80.0
1 or More	28.9	28.0	20.0
	N = 52	N = 25	N = 5

about departments which claim to have felt no pressure at all toward affirmative action. Even for those who have felt some pressure, the results have not been to hire women and minorities in overwhelming numbers. Only a few departments claim pressure to hire unqualified people, and the perception of such pressure has not led to disproportionate hires (Table 5). Over half of those who felt such pressure resisted successfully!

****

TABLES 4,5 ABOUT HERE

****

Just where does such pressure come from? The most commonly checked source was university officials. A surprisingly large group checked the category "other" and mentioned their own sense of justice as the motivating force. Students were by far the least influential source of pressure with women or minority groups ranking next to last (Table 6). Government agencies and department colleagues fit a middle position. Such findings reinforce the importance of committed administrators. It should be kept in mind that only two administrations are involved here. What varies considerably is the perception of pressure by those under their influence.

****

TABLE 6 ABOUT HERE

****

Table 5

Hiring Rates and Pressure to Hire Unqualified

Pressure:	None	Slight	Great
a. Women Hired			
None	46.2	56.0	40.0
1 or More	66.7	44.0	60.0
	N = 52	N = 25	N = 5
b. Minorities Hired			
None	71.2	72.0	80.0
1 or More	28.9	28.0	20.0
	N = 52	N = 25	N = 5

Table 6

Pressure for Affirmative Action by Source

Pressure	Source:	University Administration		Departmental Colleagues		Women or Minorities		Government		Other	
		Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No
None		4.3	9.5	6.3	8.2	7.1	7.8	0	10.4	0	10.4
Slight		33.3	71.4	75.0	67.3	57.1	72.5	64.7	70.8	64.7	70.8
Great		46.7	19.0	18.8	24.5	35.7	19.6	35.3	18.8	35.3	18.8
		N = 23	N = 42	N = 16	N = 49	N = 14	N = 51	N = 17	N = 48	N = 17	N = 48

As to the effect of the pressure on hiring rates, pressure by women seems to be marginally effective (Table 7).[16] Pressure from the government, on the other hand, seems to have a negative impact (Table 8). Not surprisingly, the number of women hired is affected by pressure that is "self-induced" (Table 9). This pressure from within seems to be one of the most critical variables here. When controlled for those instances in which at least a few women applications existed, this relationship intensifies (Table 10).

****

TABLES 7,8,9 ABOUT HERE

****

Other charges that are often leveled against affirmative action plans are that they lead to loss of autonomy within the university, encourage a decline in standards, and create a drain on various departmental resources. Again it should be kept in mind that we are measuring only department head's perceptions of these changes. Nevertheless it is interesting to note that those who have hired no women are more likely to perceive such detrimental effects than those who have (Tables 11-13). Of course some aspects of resource usage (i.e., record keeping) exist no matter who is hired. It is difficult to perceive how affirmative action is harming quality, however, if no affirmative action candidates are given jobs.

Table 7

Number of Women Hired by Pressure From Women and Minorities

	No	Yes
None	54.9	35.7
1 or More	45.1	64.3
	N = 51	N = 14

Table 8

Number of Women Hired by Pressure From Government

	No	Yes
None	45.8	64.7
1 or More	54.2	35.3
	N = 48	N = 17

Table 9

Number of Women Hired by Pressure From "Other Sources"

	No	Yes
None	56.3	35.3
1 or More	43.8	64.7
	N = 48	N = 17

****

TABLES 10, 11, 12 ABOUT HERE

****

In terms of deciding just what affirmative action requires, department heads offered a variety of explanations. The question was open-ended, but most responses could be coded into one of three categories--equal treatment, preference to those otherwise equal, and recruitment via advertising. No head felt required to hire those who did not meet some minimal level of qualifications. Preference implied hiring women or minorities only when everything else was equal, a situation which as one respondent noted is "extremely unlikely." Again a negative finding is interesting (Table 14). Those who felt that giving preference to equally qualified women or minorities was required actually hired slightly fewer women.

****

TABLE 13 ABOUT HERE

****

Another open-ended question allowed respondents to mention changes which had occurred in their hiring procedure as a result of affirmative action. The most frequently mentioned difference was a stress on active recruiting. Over ten percent specifically included national advertising as a new improvement. Another large segment mentioned an increase in record keeping. However, a

Table 10

Number of Women Hired When Applicants Exist by Pressure From "Other Sources"

	No	Yes
None	48.8	15.4
1 or More	51.2	84.6
	N = 41	N = 13

Table 11

Autonomy Loss and Women Hired

Loss	Hired: None	1 or More
None	52.5	68.3
Slight	37.5	24.4
Great	10.0	7.3
	N = 40	N = 41

Table 12

Quality Loss and Women Hired

Loss	Hired: None	1 or More
None	59.0	68.3
Slight	35.9	29.3
Great	5.1	2.4
	N = 39	N = 41

Table 13

Resource Loss and Women Hired

Loss	Hired: None	1 or More
None	40.0	51.2
Slight	50.0	41.5
Great	10.0	7.3
	N = 40	N = 41

Table 14

Hiring Rates and Affirmative Action Interpretation

	Equality Treatment	Preference to Women/Min	Advertise
Women Hired			
None	45.5	60.0	52.8
1 or More	54.5	40.0	47.2
	N = 22	N = 15	N = 36
Minorities Hired			
None	95.5	66.7	69.4
1 or More	4.5	33.4	30.6
	N = 22	N = 15	N = 36

substantial portion reported no change at all. Such cases could be due to sheer recalcitrance or to already highly developed recruiting methods.

The role of professional associations should not be overlooked in this regard. Professions with active women's caucuses and/or committees on the status of women and minorities have played key roles in forcing procedural changes. Some professional associations now require more systematic record keeping (and require it earlier) than do these universities or HEW.

What about the existence of reverse discrimination? Exactly ten percent of the respondents claimed to be personally acquainted with at least one such case. Most gave no details of the incident though urged to do so. The one factor which did receive mention by three sources was salary discrepancies in favor of females or minorities. Only one incident was recorded in any detail and that had occurred to a colleague when applying for a post at another university. Evidently some perceptions of favoritism towards women or minorities exist--although perhaps for those already hired. It may be significant to note that none of the heads claimed to have practiced such in their own hiring decisions and fully 90 per cent claimed not to know of any such incidents. As one respondent noted, "Our male graduate students worry about it all the time."

There was no attempt in this study to measure underutilization in any systematic way or to relate hiring

decisions to announced goals and timetables of the universities' affirmative action plans. One might assume that given genuine efforts at national advertising that the resulting candidate pool could be used to represent labor markets. Although there is no way of knowing for sure which departments replied, the figures for women applications seem substantially below those for many disciplines in the liberal arts. Granted that any position must be judged not only by department but by subfield requirements, it would appear that an increase in the total supply of women and minority applicants might bring some improvements.

On the other hand, even hiring women for every fifth slot or minorities for every tenth slot has not and cannot quickly bring any substantial improvement in total numbers. It is not clear at this point whether or not women are merely being rotated through lower ranks. Since it is evident that the total number of positions is not increasing, any less diligence may lead to fewer women than ever on the faculty.

Affirmative action seems to have made its presence felt in a number of ways. Most department heads feel at least moderate pressure and most have made some moderate concessions to change. An invasion of newcomers has not occurred nor does it seem likely. However, a backlash mentality is present in a few quarters. Despite the seeming standstill, campuses have changed significantly in other ways in the past few years. It is to these changes which we now turn.

IV. The Silver Lining

If one were to note the major changes involving women on these campuses since 1972, it would not be so much the presence of increased numbers of faculty women as women's groups and women's programs. The emergence of women's studies programs is but one example of this trend. Also at work are subtle but real changes in operating procedures which have benefited not just women or minorities but the whole university. Both these visible and invisible aspects of the transformation are often neglected in discussing the effect of affirmative action. They are in essence the silver lining which resides in the cloud of disappointment over the numerical status quo.

It should be clear at the outset that these changes cannot be unilaterally attributed to the existence of affirmative action as such. Certainly many are far beyond the realm of anything envisioned by even the most fervent HEW investigator. All are in at least partial response to that somewhat amorphous phenomenon known as the woman's movement. Yet the existence of the concept of affirmative action undoubtedly has given a certain legitimacy and a legal tool to women who might otherwise have been ignored.

One of the first of these unexpected benefits is the rationality which was introduced into the hiring and salary process by affirmative action. When institutions found they had to give reasons for decisions, they often discovered that no possible reasoning could legitimize the hodgepodge of regulations they were using. Even department heads, when asked about effects of affirmative action, spontaneously mentioned that decisions had

become more systematic. At one community college a grievance filed by one faculty woman revealed total anarchy in the salary system. The ultimate result there was an upgrading of all salaries to achieve parity with comparable institutions elsewhere in the state. While such rationality is often difficult to achieve, it can benefit white males as easily as anyone else. Partially as a result of anti-discrimination suits, all departments are now being urged to define standards for promotion and tenure and to be prepared to justify recommendations according to announced standards.

Another change with potential benefit for all is the establishment of monitoring processes and grievance procedures for various administrative decisions. Thanks to the effects of bias suits, steps are now clearer and procedures more defined for making claims against administrative decisions. Obviously procedures are not to be equated with results, yet the mere existence of an affirmative action officer represents a step forward by providing a neutral ground where grievances can be heard.

Less directly tied to requirements of executive orders and more an outgrowth of societal conditions have been the appearance on campus of various women's groups. At the universities there are formally recognized bodies. Each has played important roles in monitoring affirmative action programs and have in turn been recognized as important groups in part because affirmative action exists and the loss of contract remains a possibility, however

remote. Women's groups nationally have played crucial roles in activating HEW and precipitating crises on other campuses.

The development of women's studies programs certainly goes far beyond requirements of executive order 11246, Title VII, or even Title IX. Their rise cannot be divorced from either the appearance of influential women's groups on campus or the general legitimacy of women's issues. Often reluctantly and stingily funded, they have served as major sources of innovation in both teaching and scholarship while attracting large numbers of students. Yet some funding has been forthcoming, if only after scrounging from various funds. Not only those who have taken these courses but also those who have attended lectures of guest speakers or participated in numerous special events have had enriched educational experiences.

Perhaps the most adventurous aspect of the women's movement on these campuses has been the establishment of a woman's drop-in center at University A. Housed in an obscure basement corner of the Student Union, it has hosted film festivals and scholarly speakers with equal flair. Although it has attracted more women than men, it has added a dimension of experience on campus often not available elsewhere.

Another undoubted success story is a program called Opportunities for Women. Run as a part of the continuing education program, it has aimed at older women who might wish to return to campus. A major part of its efforts are aimed at short workshops such as the one day re-entry program for school

teachers who might like to switch occupations but don't know where to start. Others, such as a workshop on how to get grant funds, are aimed more at the university community.

All of these special programs run on remarkably low budgets precariously funded. The dedication, skill, enthusiasm, and sheer guts of the directors is amazing. Yet all have garnered at least a modicum of university support and are (in enlightened moments) pointed out with pride. Why have universitites in a traditionally conservative state encouraged such radical groups? Cynics might point out that such programs are comparatively cheap, easy to establish (and perhaps to abolish), and represent no threat to the power structure. Clearly there is a danger that they will be used as side-payments, either as clear co-optation or as a way of silencing vocal critics. What do you mean we never did anything for women on this campus?

V. Where Do We Go From Here?

The situation which we have been examining involves two state universities and a number of community colleges all of which have affirmative action plans for hiring. No evidence of quotas or of reverse discrimination in any form was uncovered. Some hiring of women and minorities was occurring although how in line with availability pools was impossible to determine.

There seems to be at least moderate confusion remaining as to what standards are required. Record keeping procedures on the departmental level were more haphazard than anticipated. Concern

at upper levels of administration seemed to waiver between self protection and self congratulation.

Perhaps a special word is in order on the role of affirmative action officers. As implemented in both of the two larger universities and in the several community colleges, there is a built-in division of loyalty. On the one hand the administrative hierarcy seems supportive of affirmative action concepts as long as no other goals of the university are disturbed. On the other hand organized groups of women and minorities felt that such officers should deliver far more than they had by being active agents for change. The position of affirmative action officer is not an enviable one and life often seems to resemble Hobbes' description: "poor, nasty, brutish and short."

Certainly affirmative action officers cannot manage the whole show. Interest groups on campus need to devise some methods of applying pressure at departmental levels. Review of advertisements and monitoring recruiting visits takes time and energy but may be too important to leave to professional staff.

For those who favor the vigorous application of affirmative action, some pathways are clear. Some department heads still claim to feel no pressure to hire women or minorities; most often such pressure is still perceived at the moderate level. Comparatively few will admit to any real loss of autonomy or quality. Resource losses are more frequent, but again at the moderate level.

In sum, affirmative action does not yet seem to be the great

disruptive source which many have feared. As the percentage of women and minorities (at least in the lower ranks) continues to climb, there may be recognition that compliance does not mean automatic disaster. Neither does it mean utopia. There will be a continuing need for both government and interest group monitoring of local programs. What we have looked at here is one small part--the decision of whom to hire--of a much larger problem. Salary, promotion, grievances, course distribution, and research opportunities are other areas where women and minorities have been neglected. The silver lining should not lull anyone into complacency. What has been observed is one legal requirement in operation. The complexities in even this one small area are enormous. Yet the policy seems to be working without the disasters which many had predicted. Affirmative action is possible and necessary on both legal and moral levels.

Appendix I

1. Has your department had occasion to hire any new faculty during the past two years? Yes_____ No_____
(If no, skip to question 8)

2. How many full-time positions have you filled during that time? _____

3. Did you feel any pressure to hire women or minorities for these slots?
None_____ Slight_____ Great_____

4. Did you feel pressure to hire women or minorities whether or not they were the most qualified for the position?
None_____ Slight_____ Great_____

5. If pressure existed, did it come from: (check as many as applicable)
University administrators_____ Departmental colleagues_____
Minority Groups_____ Students_____
Governmental Agencies_____ Women or other_____

6. Estimate the percentage of applicants for your position(s) who were
women_____ minorities_____

7. How many of these positions were filled by women?_____
by minorities?_____

8. Summarize briefly your understanding of what your responsibilities are in hiring matters under your institution's affirmative action plan.

9. Do you feel that affirmative action threatens any loss of quality to your department?
None_____ Slight_____ Great_____

10. Do you feel any loss in department autonomy?
None_____ Slight_____ Great_____

11. Do you feel that affirmative action requirements have put a strain on departmental resources?
None_____ Slight_____ Great_____

12. Do you know of any "reverse discrimination" suffered by white males within your department? yes_____ no_____
If yes, explain briefly:

13. Summarize any changes in your hiring practices which have occurred as a result of affirmative action.

FOOTNOTES

1. Among the more well known critiques are Nathan Glazer Affirmative Discrimination (New York: Basic Books, 1975) and Richard Lester Antibias Regulation of Universities (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1974). The former relies on anecdotal data while the latter deals with secondary analysis of salary and availability studies. On the positive side see Alice Rossi (ed.), Academic Women on the Move (New York, 1973).

2. For an excellent discussion of the whole history of executive orders see Jamie Beth Catlin, John Seeley, and Margaret Talburtt Affirmativel Action: Its Legal Mandate and Organizational Implication (Ann Arbor, 1974).

3. Executive Order 11246 as amended. Kenneth Davidsom, Ruth Bader Ginsburg, Herma Hill Kay Sex-Based Discrimination (St. Paul, 1974), pp. 956-957.

4. For details of Revised Order No. 4 and its requirements see Affirmative Action and Equal Employment, U.S. Equal Employment Opportunity Commission Handbook, January, 1974, Appendix D-27.

5. It appears likely that the ruling will be a narrow one and not necessarily directly applicable to all affirmative action programs.

6. Questions as to proof of discrimination in either direction, for example, will still be relevant. Even if strict quote systems are abolished employees who hire no minorities may be in violation of the law.

7. For the result of a previous study see Barbara Lorch "Reverse Discrimination in Sociology Departments: A Preliminary Report." The American Sociologist VIII (August, 1973) p. 119.

8. See Lester, footnote 1.

9. Much of the material which appears in even general works comes from the campuses. See Catherine Stimpson (ed.), Academic Women on the Move (New York, 1973).

10. The concept of underutilization is crucial to the whole idea of affirmative action, but getting good measures of available work pools has just begun. Sharing of such information among institutions is just beginning to take place.

11. There is an official requirement to draw up and publicize the plan as part of meeting affirmative action requirements. Widespread dissemination is difficult enough under the best of circumstances. EEOC Handbook, pp. 18-23.

12. Lack of available job slots is often presented as the excuse, especially in economically troubled times. Data here will show that even in the absence of a rapid expansion in the economy, work force turnover may be higher than expected.

13. "If a statistical survey shows that minorities and females are not participating in your workforce at all levels in reasonable relation to their presence in the population and the labor force, the burden of proof is on you to show that this is not the result of discrimination." EEOC, Handbook, p. 7. 14. Admittedly hiring practices usually are done on the basis of "slots" available rather than total salary. However that is not always the case, especially in community colleges.

15. Median is the mathematical average. Modal is the most frequent score.

16. While figures here are reported for women only, those for minorities are comparable.